

San Francisco Workshop
May 22, 2008, 6 p.m. – 8 p.m.
San Francisco State Downtown Campus
San Francisco, CA

Some 75 people were in attendance. Commissioner Jon Rubin offered introductory remarks. Participants watched a 12-minute video, and then had the opportunity to answer a series of questions via electronic voting. A discussion followed each question, where participants were able to bring up other issues, questions and concerns.

NOTE: After the introductory video, there was a brief question and answer period, as follows:

- Q. Why not talk about committed funds?
A: Only \$30 billion in uncommitted funds
- Q. Fighting global warming #1 concern, how can justify freeway expansion projects since increase VMT.
A: Not talking about uncommitted
- Q. Exercise not meaningful since we won't be talking about large amount of projects in committed funds.
- Q. What are congestion relief projects, low emissions projects
- Q. What about conversion to other fuel sources and end of oil?
- Q. How is safety considered (bikes and peds, seismic)?
A: Safety considered in seismic retrofit
- Q. How are stricter driver standards? – represent skaters – open streets to skateboarders, sidewalks.
- Q. Why not talking about \$132 billion? Commission or staff direction?
A: Breakdown of STIP, FTIP for funds, voter mandate, funds would remain committed.

The Three E's

How would you rank these three goals?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Economy	59	32.60%
Environment	61	33.70%
Equity	61	33.70%
Totals	181	100%

Maintenance

Which of these should be a higher investment priority for the region's transportation system?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Option A: making investments to maintain the existing system of roads, and the existing bus, rail and ferry services in the region	32	56.14%
Option B: making investments to build new roads and add more bus, rail and ferry services in the region	25	43.86%
Totals	57	100%

Comments:

- Upgrade public transit, bike and ped emphasis
- Better quality buses, low emissions, upgrades
- Transit, BART high priority, maintain system
- As fuel goes up have to make more nuclear power plants.
- Option not there, driving not direction headed in, building roads, divert money from transit, spend money on roads to reduce size

How much of our \$30M should be spent on maintenance?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Up to 25% (\$7.5 billion)	24	45.28%
Up to 50% (\$15 billion)	16	30.19%
Up to 75% (\$22.5 billion)	12	22.64%
100% (\$30 billion)	1	1.89%
Totals	53	100%

Comments:

- Chose lowest category, because highest need
- Chose 50% - San Francisco's streets are bad; need repair for cyclists
- Invest in new technologies
- Picked 50% because ferry's pollute too much, trains offer laziness, skateboards offer excitement

Congestion Relief

Which of these should be a higher investment priority for the region's transportation system?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Option A: Investing in highway system to relieve traffic congestion. (For example, ramp metering, high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes.)	3	5.17%
Option B: Investing in public transit options including rail and buses to provide alternatives to driving.	43	74.14%
Option C: Investing in walking paths and bicycle lanes to provide alternatives to driving.	12	20.69%
Totals	58	100%

Comments:

- Crashes not accidents, doing things to reduce crashes, like traffic calming
- Congestion not 24 hrs per day
- Widening roads does not reduce congestion
- Remove people from freeways by putting on transit
- Option B over C – not everyone can ride a bike, can take bike on transit
- Option B – provide intercity transit, crime goes down and improves safety and equity, reducing highways best option

- Encourage walking by improving safety
- Prefers Option B – Option A encourages more sprawl, encourage transit villages

What do you think is the best way to share the road with trucks?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Keep trucks out of the peak commuter hours	14	27.45%
Allow smaller trucks to use carpool lanes during congested periods for a fee	3	5.88%
Encourage more cargo deliveries be made by rail or ferries	23	45.10%
Build exclusive truck lanes supported by trucking fees	5	9.80%
Provide more truck parking in commercial business areas	6	11.76%
Totals	51	100%

Comments:

- 45% more cargo by rail or ferries
- Parking in bus areas- trucks need to stop, keep jobs there
- Option 5 – don't block other modes
- Option 3 – get trucks off commute hours, reduce emissions
- Option 1 – Roger – helps keep BRT moving, early morning hours
- Rail service on RSR bridge
- Option 4 – trucks do more damage on road and cause more pollution

Focused Growth

Which of these should be a higher investment priority?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Option A: Providing more transportation funds to communities that are planning to build more housing along BART and other public transit lines	53	85.48%
Option B: Providing transportation funds evenly to communities regardless of where they are planning to build homes	9	14.52%
Totals	62	100%

Comments:

- Majority say funds to transit near housing
- Electric tricycle – feeder system to transit
- Option B – Low income people can't afford to live near transit
- Option A – Could support transit for low income
- Need to address social justice for transit villages – car use expensive, poor people car dependent stay poor
- Option B – Feeds sprawl

Access

Transit Subsidy Based on Income: Transit fare discounts are currently given to youth, seniors, and the disabled. In addition to these subsidies, do you think there should be a subsidy for low-income transit riders?

There should be a subsidy for low-income riders.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	17	29.82%
Agree	19	33.33%
Neutral	10	17.54%
Disagree	7	12.28%
Strongly Disagree	4	7.02%
Totals	57	100%

Comments:

- There should be a needs pass – eliminate for people can afford it
- Who will do maintenance of system?
- Willing to pay more for low income
- Neutral – focus more on education
- Suggests lifeline pass

I favor basing all transit fare subsidies on income rather than age or disability.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	6	11.11%
Agree	7	12.96%
Neutral	12	22.22%
Disagree	15	27.78%
Strongly Disagree	14	25.93%
Totals	54	100%

Comments:

- Transit already subsidized – automobiles subsidized- remove all subsidies
- Older people have other costs
- School children, seniors most vulnerable, want to market to groups
- Access needs to be related to service
- Senior discount

Emissions Reduction

Which of these should be a higher investment priority?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Option A: Focusing on reducing tailpipe emissions and encouraging alternatives to driving.	53	94.64%
Option B: Improving our ability to drive more easily around the Bay Area.	3	5.36%
Totals	56	100%

Which programs do you think are most effective to reduce the amount of CO2 emissions?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Subsidize purchase of newer/cleaner vehicles	5	8.77%
Provide more/cheaper public transit	21	36.84%
Develop regional awareness campaign to encourage people to reduce fossil fuel use	3	5.26%
Build more bike paths and sidewalks	6	10.53%
Funding incentives to cities to allow more development near transit	19	33.33%
Support local traffic signal timing coordination	3	5.26%
Totals	57	100%

Comments:

- Removing gross polluters from roadways
- Parking pricing
- Electrification of transit
- Support transit and building near transit stations coord LU and transit
- What is effect of 6 million breathing CO2
- Smart growth – effective at reducing VMT
- How much does the greenbelt reduce CO2?

Investment Tradeoffs

You have \$10 – Click each number once for each dollar you want to spend.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Maintenance	94	17.90%
Congestion Relief	66	12.57%
Focus Growth	148	28.19%
Access	97	18.48%
Emissions Reduction	120	22.86%
Totals	525	100%

New Revenues

Which of the following new revenue sources would you support? (Multiple answers OK)	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Regional gas fee	47	21.86%
Higher bridge toll	35	16.28%
Road tolls	34	15.81%
Vehicle registration fees	43	20%
County transportation sales taxes	27	12.56%
Other new revenues	25	11.63%
No new fees or increases	4	1.86%
Totals	215	100%

Comments:

- Congestion pricing
- Collect MUNI fares
- Tax assessment districts
- Public private investment
- Parking revenue districts
- Parking fees
- Cordon pricing, congestion pricing
- Federal gas tax
- Vehicle weight tax

Open Comments:

Category	County	Comment
TOD	San Francisco	¾ mile radius from transit, need to enforce TOD
Transit fares	San Francisco	Integrate regional transit fares
Misc.	San Francisco	How many people don't own auto (question asked to crowd)– (lots)
Maintenance	San Francisco	Don't spend any money on new freeways, only O/M
Government	San Francisco	Consolidate transit agencies
Transit	San Francisco	Modal transfers between operators, transit stops running too early
Transit	San Francisco	Bus Rapid Transit in the East Bay
Bicycles	San Francisco	More bike access on transit

Written Comments Submitted at Workshop:

Category	County	Comment
Bikes	San Francisco	Bart should allow bicyclists onboard their trains during peak commute hours. New bicycle/luggage spaces are now being provided inside trains. A limited number of permits can be issued to bicyclists wanting to bring their bikes onboard BART during commute hours.
Transit	San Francisco	SamTrans should provide hourly bus service between the Daly City and SFO Millbrae BART stations during the late night hours when BART service is closed. This bus service would also connect wit Muni's 14-Mission owl bus line at San Jose Ave in Daly City (Top of the Hill) down south toward the San Mateo County BART stations.
TOD	San Francisco	Land-use blended strategically with TOD and transportation hubs and access will be the best economic [rest is illegible]
Transit	San Francisco	More funding for transit and less funding for highways and roads.
Funding Preferences	San Francisco	Provide considerable funding for new transit infrastructure and provide extremely limited funds for new highways and roads
Safety	San Francisco	Should call out investment in safety (including traffic, pedestrian, bike safety and seismic retrofit)
Revenue Sources	San Francisco	Parking prices/taxes should be included as a choice as many other attendees suggested
Meeting	San Francisco	Workshop should have had more background info like what the current investment patterns are, what makes up the \$190 B committed
Meeting	San Francisco	Ran out of time, so gave no info on process and next steps. Too general
Bikes	San Francisco	More bike pathways are needed. By far the most bang for your buck—very cheap to get 5% off the roads and onto bike/foot
Meeting	San Francisco	Excellent, please do more as the crises develop/deepen
Meeting	San Francisco	This time could have been better spent by providing more information about some general project types that are being considered, rather than collecting the public's opinion which may or may not be useful to the group. Educating the group with the valuable information that MTC has could have been beneficial. For example, someone should have explained MTC's process and timeline in more detail.
Meeting	San Francisco	Good presentation. Hope comments will be taken into account
Bikes	San Francisco	Renting bike solution as velib in Paris
Bikes	San Francisco	The multiuse path on the East span of the SF/Oakland Bay Bridge is in place on the skyway section, but it will be of little use to bicyclists if it is not continued onto the West span
Tunnels	San Francisco	Suggesting two tunnels be built. See attached PDF
Meeting	San Francisco	Questions were in many cases confusing or were so broad that they failed to reflect policy concerns regarding mode split and similar issues
Investment Categories	San Francisco	We should focus the funds on Emissions Reduction, Focused Growth, and Access

Category	County	Comment
Transit	San Francisco	No freeway should be expanded. We need to change transit first. Invest in transit, encourage development near transit, improve walkability, bikeability
Revenue Sources	San Francisco	Bring back vehicle registration fees to pre-Schwartz era. Initiate congestion pricing. Put carbon tax on vehicle registration. Mandate spending for public transit
Bikes	San Francisco	Bike lanes across Richmond and Bay Bridges. Improve bike access to transit
Government	San Francisco	Like New York and New Jersey's Port Authority the Bay Area should unify transit planning and spending under MTC. Airports should not be competing for use. Transit transfers need better coordination to improve transit use.
TOD	San Francisco	I strongly support intensifying development around transit. Although more funding is going into TODs than before, still more funding is needed to bring in enough density and mix of uses to make the TODs meaningful. Currently there are too many "TODs from which most residents commute by car because of the density/mix of uses/transit capacity/land use do not support their transit use.
Meeting	San Francisco	Thank you the meeting was great
Meeting	San Francisco	Very interesting

Demographic Questions asked at Workshop:

1.) How did you get here this evening?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Drove	2	3.51%
Public Transit	40	70.18%
Carpool	0	0%
Bike	7	12.28%
Walked	8	14.04%
Totals	57	100%
2.) How would you describe yourself?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Business Advocate	11	7.64%
Environmental Advocate	30	20.83%
Community Advocate	27	18.75%
Government/Agency Staff	17	11.81%
Concerned Individual	43	29.86%
Social Justice Advocate	16	11.11%
Elected Official	0	0%
Totals	144	100%
3.) How did you hear about tonight's meeting?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Flyer	22	35.48%
Website	2	3.23%
Email	27	43.55%
Other	11	17.74%
Totals	62	100%
4.) Do you use public transportation regularly? (one to two times a week)	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Yes	56	90.32%
No	6	9.68%
Totals	62	100%
5.) Have you attended a public meeting or workshop on Bay Area transportation in the past?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Yes	45	73.77%
No	16	26.23%
Totals	61	100%
6.) What County do you live in?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Alameda	8	12.70%
Contra Costa	0	0%
Marin	2	3.17%
Napa	0	0%
San Francisco	46	73.02%
San Mateo	7	11.11%
Santa Clara	0	0%
Solano	0	0%
Sonoma	0	0%
Totals	63	100%

7.) What is your gender?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Male	49	76.56%
Female	15	23.44%
Totals	64	100%
8.) Are you Hispanic/Latino?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Yes	5	8.33%
No	55	91.67%
Totals	60	100%
9.) How do you identify yourself? (click all that apply)	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
White	44	64.71%
Chinese	10	14.71%
Vietnamese	0	0%
Asian/Indian	3	4.41%
Black/African American	2	2.94%
Japanese	0	0%
Filipino	2	2.94%
American Indian/Alaskan	1	1.47%
Other Asian	4	5.88%
Other Race	2	2.94%
Totals	68	100%
10.) What is your age?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
24 years and under	5	7.69%
Between 25 and 59	49	75.38%
Over 60	11	16.92%
Totals	65	100%

Workshop Evaluation Survey:

30.) I had the opportunity to provide comments.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	18	48.65%
Agree	16	43.24%
Neutral	2	5.41%
Disagree	1	2.70%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	37	100%
31.) I found the meeting useful and informative.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	8	20.51%
Agree	18	46.15%
Neutral	10	25.64%
Disagree	3	7.69%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	39	100%
32.) I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	8	18.60%
Agree	21	48.84%
Neutral	11	25.58%
Disagree	3	6.98%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	43	100%
33.) The information presented was clear and had an appropriate level of detail.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	5	11.90%
Agree	11	26.19%
Neutral	11	26.19%
Disagree	13	30.95%
Strongly Disagree	2	4.76%
Totals	42	100%
34.) A quality discussion of key issues took place.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	4	9.52%
Agree	18	42.86%
Neutral	10	23.81%
Disagree	9	21.43%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.38%
Totals	42	100%
35.) I learned more about transportation planning in the Bay Area by participating tonight.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	4	9.09%
Agree	20	45.45%
Neutral	14	31.82%
Disagree	5	11.36%
Strongly Disagree	1	2.27%
Totals	44	100%

36.) There were no barriers (language or other) that prevented me from participating.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	21	47.73%
Agree	21	47.73%
Neutral	1	2.27%
Disagree	1	2.27%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	44	100%